Exhibit 300: Part I: Summary Information and Justification (All Capital Assets)

I.A. Overview

1. Date of Submission:	9/11/2006
2. Agency:	Department of Transportation
3. Bureau:	Federal Aviation Administration
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	FAAXX604: User Request Evaluation Tool (URET)
5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.)	021-12-01-11-01-1200-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)	Operations and Maintenance
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	FY2002

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

User Request Evaluation Tool, or URET, is a decision support aid that automatically tells air traffic controllers of potential conflicts between aircraft, as well as between aircraft and special use airspace. A pilot wanting to change routing or altitude from an assigned flight plan must request the change through an air traffic controller. The controller can enter a trial plan into URET to determine whether the change is conflict free. The advisory software can predict aircraft-to-aircraft conflicts 20 minutes ahead in time and aircraft-to-airspace conflicts 40 minutes ahead of the aircraft's current position. The tool allows air traffic controllers to more efficiently determine whether proposed flight plan changes will conflict with other aircraft or airspace. By allowing controllers to evaluate route change requests and more often assign conflict free direct routings, the aircraft operators are able to save the aviation community both time and fuel. URET benefit measurements are based on the ability of the URET system to allow the controller to provide the airlines more direct routes. Based on the time and distance saved by URET issuing these direct routes, the savings/benefits can be determined. URET also includes an electronic flight data management capability that allows air traffic controllers to electronically manipulate the flight plan information that was previously manually managed on paper flight strips. This automated capability relieves the air traffic controller of tedious flight strip sorting and marking by electronically managing the flight plans. While URET provides planning and advisory information, controllers still separate and control the aircraft. Without URET the savings provided by the direct routings could not be realized. Status: RET finished deployment and is operational at all 20 Air Route Traffic Control Centers (ARTCCs) as of June 2006. Starting in FY2007 URET is in the steady state segment or phase of the life cycle. An E-Gov strategy review was conducted and the report briefed to the Air Traffic Organizations (ATO) Vice Presidents in March 2006. The report found that URET is still meeting all of its requirements and providing the expected benefits and is expected to continue to do so through December 2010 when it will be subsumed by the En Route Automation Management (ERAM) system as required by the ERAM 2003 JRC. An operational analysis was completed on July 31, 2006. A PIR is being scheduled for FY2007.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	Yes
a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	6/12/2002

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	Yes

11. Contact information of Project Manager?

Name

Phone Number

Email	
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.	Yes
a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	Yes
b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	No
1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?	
2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?	
3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?	
13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives?	No
If "yes," check all that apply:	
13a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)?	
14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)	Yes
a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?	Yes
b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool?	FAA Air Traffic Services
c. If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?	Adequate
15. Is this investment for information technology?	Yes

If the answer to Question: "Is this investment for information technology?" was "Yes," complete this sub-section. If the answer is "No," do not answer this sub-section.

For information technology investments only:	
16. What is the level of the IT Project?	Level 2

(per CIO Council PM Guidance)

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance):	(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment
18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?	No
19. Is this a financial management system?	No
a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	
1. If "yes," which compliance area:	
2. If "no," what does it address?	
b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52	

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	10.000000
Software	80.000000
Services	5.000000
Other	5.000000
21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?	N/A

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name

Phone Number

Title	
E-mail	
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	Yes

I.B. Summary of Funding

Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The total

estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY - 1 and Earlier	PY 2006	CY 2007	BY 2008	BY + 1 2009	BY + 2 2010	BY + 3 2011	BY + 4 and Beyond	Total
Planning									
Budgetary Resources	6.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	602.65	72.567	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition									
Budgetary Resources	608.9	72.567	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance									
Budgetary Resources	42	27.522	26.5	19.7	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL									
Budgetary Resources	650.9	100.089	26.5	19.7	0	0	0	0	0
Government FTE Costs									
Budgetary Resources	7.91	1.723	0.353	0.353	0	0	0	0	0
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	55.35	12.25	2.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0

Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?	No
a. If "yes," How many and in what year?	

I.C. Acquisition/Contract Strategy

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

The first contract awarded in FY 2002 is a firm fixed price contract. Since this contract ends on September 30, 2006 adding EVM now would not provide useful performance data. To date this contract is on schedule and within cost. URET program is a steady state or operations and maintenance effort. There is very minimal risk assumed with the execution of the remaining cost plus contracts, the tasks are well defined and the experience level of the contractors is mature. Constant monitoring of the LOE contractors performance by daily contact, weekly meetings, program status reports, and constant communications ensures that the URET program manager is aware of the status of the program at all times. The Government does not assume abnormal risk due to the Level of Effort in this contract.

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?	Yes
a. Explain why:	The air traffic controllers must meet strict medical qualifications under OPM Qualification Standards, GS-2152, Air Traffic Control Series, as stated in FAA Order 3930.3A, Air Traffic Control Specialist Health

Program. The GS-2152 require controllers to meet strict qualifications with respect to vision, hearing and other physical abilities that preclude the need for application of the 508 standards described at 1194 for this equipment.

4. Is there an acquisition plan which has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?	Yes
a. If "yes," what is the date?	6/11/2002
b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?	
1. If "no," briefly explain why:	

I.D. Performance Information

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

Performance Information Table 1:					
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Performance Measure	Actual/baseline (from Previous Year)	Planned Performance Metric (Target)	Performance Metric Results (Actual)
2002	DOT Goal/ Mobility: increasing system reliability. By 2008, increase the percent of flights arriving on time to 83.64%FAA Goal/Greater Capacity/ Objective 2: Make air traffic flow over land and sea more efficient.	Increase number of direct routings by approximately an average of 0.5 nmi per aircraft.	Direct routings and miles saved were increased by 15-50% at the existing URET sites.	Miles Saved (1999-2002) by the Direct Routing Goal: Increase in miles saved from direct amendments by 3,326 nmi/day over baseline (83,500) (average for 4 year period) User Cost Savings Goal (1999-2002):$22,000 per day in aircraft operating costs.	Miles Saved (1999-2002) by the Direct Routing Results: Increase of 6,545 nmi/day at sites in baseline (83,500)(average over 4 year period) User Cost Savings Results (1999-2002): $43,000 per day in aircraft operating costs.(Completed)
2003	Mobility: increasing system reliability. By 2008, increase the percent of flights	Increase miles saved by direct routings by approximately 0.5 nmi per center.	A substantial increase of 27% in direct routings and distance saved was achieved.	Miles Saved by the Direct Routing Goal: Increase of 13,700 nmi/day over baseline of	Miles Saved by the Direct Routing Results: Increase of 26,300 nmi/day at sites in baseline

	arriving on time to 83.64%FAA Goal/Greater Capacity/ Objective 2: Make air traffic flow over land and sea more efficient.			96,300. User Cost Savings Goal: $93,000 per day in aircraft operating costs (then-year).	User Cost Savings Results: $178,000 per day in aircraft operating costs (then-year) during FY2003. (Completed)	
2004	Mobility: increasing system reliability. By 2008, increase the percent of flights arriving on time to 83.64%FAA Goal/Greater Capacity/ Objective 2: Make air traffic flow over land and sea more efficient.	Increase miles saved by direct routings by approximately 0.5 nmi per day per center.	Increase miles saved by direct routings by approximately 0.5 nmi per day per center.	Miles saved by the direct routing goal: Increase of 21,900 nmi/day over baseline of 125,500.	Miles Saved by the Direct Routing Results: Increase of 54,794 nmi/day at sites in baseline. (Completed) All of the FY2002 through FY2005 metrics have been completed and will not be reported in FY2009.	
2005	Mobility: increasing system reliability. By 2008, increase the percent of flights arriving on time to 83.64%FAA Goal/Greater Capacity/ Objective 2: Make air traffic flow over land and sea more efficient.	Increase in miles saved by direct routings.	Five centers were deployed in FY2005. The baseline levels are determined by a 1 year data collection effort at each site prior to installation. First FY2005 center was available in March 2005. The FY2005 baseline was 190,460 nmi saved by amendments.	Miles saved by direct routing goal: Increase of 28,569 nmi/day over baseline of 190,460.	Miles Saved by the Direct Routing Results: Increase of 68,716 nmi/day at sites in baseline. Cost Savings Results: $481,017 per day in aircraft operating costs during FY2005 (using then year estimates of cost/mile). (Completed)	

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

Performance Information Table 2:						
Fiscal Year	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
2005	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Distance savings form increase direct routings.	18.4 million nmi (1999-2004 URET savings)	11.0 million nmi	Data available as of 1/06 shows that the distance saved has increased by 25.0 million nmi which is over 100% of the goal.
2005	Mission and	Transportation	Air	Cumulative	$117.5 M in	URET plans to	Data available

	Business Results		Transportation	aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings	aircraft direct operating cost savings (1999-2004 URET savings)	save the aviation community a total of $76.4M in FY05.	as of 1/06 shows that the savings for FY2005 were $174.9M approximately 130% greater than planned goal.
2005	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	30% usage	Increase percentage to 50%	As of 1/06 70% of the controllers where using URET.
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of the time that URET is available to the user.	.999% available requirement	URET should exceed requirement	Latest analysis for URET dated 1/06 shows .9992% availability
2005	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered through URET	30%	50%	Data available as of 1/06 shows that 75% of centers are entering more than 32% of their flight plan amendments through URET.
2006	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Satisfaction	Distance savings from increased direct routings.	30.1 million nmi (1999-2005 URET savings).	15.1 million nmi in FY2006.	Thru June 30, 2006 a total of 22.5 million nmi have been saved.
2006	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	URET has saved the aviation community a total of $447.7M (1999-2005 URET savings)	Planned improvement for FY2006 is an additional $106.2M.	Data will be available 1/07. As of June 30, 2006 the savings is 61,643 nmi/day and $430,685 per day in aircraft operating costs savings. This equals an annual savings to ate of $157.2M which is beating the $106.2 goal for FY2006.

2006	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	50% usage	Increase percentage to 70%.	As of June 30, 2006 95% of the controllers where using URET.
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of the time URET is available to users.	.999% availability requirement.	URET should exceed requirement.	Latest analysis for URET dated 5/15/06 shows .9992% availability.
2006	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered through URET	50% usage	80%	Data available as of June 30, 2006 shows that 95% of centers are entering more than 32% of their flight plan amendments through URET.
2007	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Distance savings from increased direct routings	46.1 million nmi (1999-2006 URET savings)	19.6 million nmi in FY2007	Data will be available 01/08.
2007	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	$444.7 million (1999-2006 URET savings)	URET plans to save the aviation community a total of $140.6M in FY07.	Data will be available 1/08.
2007	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	70% usage	Increase percentage to 100%.	Data will be available 1/08.
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of the time URET is available to users	.999% available requirement.	URET should exceed requirement.	Data will be available 1/08.
2007	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered	80%	90%	Data will be available 1/08.

				through URET			
2008	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Distance savings from increased direct routings.	38.9 million nmi (1999-2005 URET savings).	15.1 million nmi in FY2008	Data will be available in 01/09
2008	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	$447.7 million nmi (1999-2005 URET savings).	URET plans to save the aviation community a total of $106.2M in FY2008.	Data will be available in 01/09.
2008	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	70% usage	Continue to maintain controller usage at 100%.	Data will be available 01/09
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of the time URET is available to users	.999% available requirement.	URET should exceed requirement.	Data will be available 1/09.
2008	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered through URET	80%	Continue at 100% of the centers using URET for at least 15% of the flight plan amendments.	Data will be available 01/09.
2009	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden	Distance savings from increased direct routings	38.9 million nmi (1999-2006 URET savings)	15.1 million nmi in FY2009	Data will be available 01/10.
2009	Mission and Business Results	Transportation	Air Transportation	Cumulative aircraft direct operating cost dollars saved by URET sites by increasing direct routings.	$493.4 million nmi (1999-2005 URET savings)	URET plans to save the aviation community a total of $106.2M in FY2009	Data will be available 01/10.
2009	Processes and Activities	Productivity and Efficiency	Productivity	Increase percentage of air traffic controllers using URET electronic flight data management in radar coverage sectors.	70% usage	Continue to maintain controller usage at 100%.	Data will be available 01/10
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Accessibility	Percentage of the time URET is available to	.999% available requirement	URET should exceed requirement.	Data will be available 1/10.

				users			
2009	Technology	Efficiency	Improvement	Percentage of En Route centers where at least 15% of flight plan amendments are entered through URET	80%	Continue at 100% of the centers using URET for at least 15% of the flight plan amendments.	Data will be available 01/10.

I.E. Security and Privacy

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

All systems supporting and/or part of this investment should be included in the tables below, inclusive of both agency owned systems and contractor systems. For IT investments under development, security and privacy planning must proceed in parallel with the development of the system/s to ensure IT security and privacy requirements and costs are identified and incorporated into the overall lifecycle of the system/s.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified and integrated into the overall costs of the investment:	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the budget year:	0.550000
2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part of the overall risk management effort for each system supporting or part of this investment.	Yes

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?	Yes
a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated agency's plan of action and milestone process?	Yes
6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?	No
a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.	

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:						
Name of System	**Is this a new system?**	**Is there a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) that covers this system?**	**Is the PIA available to the public?**	**Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system?**	**Was a new or amended SORN published in FY 06?**
Display System Replacement	No	No, because the system does not contain,	No, because a PIA is not yet required	No	No, because the system is not a

(DSR)		process, or transmit personal identifying information.	to be completed at this time.		Privacy Act system of records.
User Request Evaluation Tool (URET)	No	No, because the system does not contain, process, or transmit personal identifying information.	No, because a PIA is not yet required to be completed at this time.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

I.F. Enterprise Architecture (EA)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?	Yes

a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?	No

a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

b. If "no," please explain why?

To effectively balance the development and management of the DOT Transition Strategy, the first version was scoped to include those investments with development activities (non O&M). Additionally, as the NAS Architecture was publicly available, it was also not fully integrated with the materials forwarded to OMB in February 2006. However, the NAS is considered part of the DOT Transition Strategy and will be more fully integrated within the next revision. Future revisions are set to expand upon that scope and include both steady state (O&M) investments and expanded linkages to the NAS Architecture. Since this FAA investment does not appear to be specifically mentioned within the DOT Transition Strategy or the FAA Modernization Blueprint, please refer to the following public NAS website which documents the plan for the FAA's target architecture where the investment can be found as well as a sequencing plan showing the dependencies:http://www.nas-architecture.faa.gov/nas5/downloads/full_oi_long_report.pdf. See page 24.

3. Service Reference Model (SRM) Table:

Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/.

Agency Component Name	Agency Component Description	Service Domain	FEA SRM Service Type	FEA SRM Component	FEA Service Component Reused Name	FEA Service Component Reused UPI	Internal or External Reuse?	BY Funding Percentage
Airborne	Airborne synchronization or spacing and	Back Office Services	Development and Integration	Software Development			No Reuse	100

	sequencing of air traffic safely maximize the efficiency and capacity of the NAS throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure phases of flight. Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate user preferences. (NAS TM Synchronization)							
Airborne	Airborne synchronization or spacing and sequencing of air traffic safely maximize the efficiency and capacity of the NAS throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure phases of flight. Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate user preferences. (NAS TM Synchronization)	Business Analytical Services	Knowledge Discovery	Data Mining			No Reuse	0
Airborne	Airborne synchronization or spacing and sequencing of air traffic safely maximize the efficiency and capacity of the	Business Management Services	Organizational Management	Network Management			No Reuse	0

	NAS throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure phases of flight. Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate user preferences. (NAS TM Synchronization)						
Airborne	Airborne synchronization or spacing and sequencing of air traffic safely maximize the efficiency and capacity of the NAS throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure phases of flight. Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate user preferences. (NAS TM Synchronization)	Support Services	Security Management	Access Control		No Reuse	0
Airborne	Airborne synchronization or spacing and sequencing of air traffic safely maximize the efficiency and capacity of the NAS throughout the cruise, arrival, and departure phases of flight.	Support Services	Security Management	Intrusion Detection		No Reuse	0

	Traffic synchronization is provided to aircraft during cruise, through metering at fixes/waypoints, and modifying traffic flow patterns to meet operational objectives and accommodate user preferences. (NAS TM Synchronization)							

Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

4. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:
To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e. vendor or product name)
Network Management	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	POWER ADA --- OC Systems APROBE ---OC Systems
Access Control	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	X-Windows ----SUN
Access Control	Component Framework	Security	Supporting Security Services	IPSEC --- CISCO
Intrusion Detection	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	VPN/IPSEC --- CISCO
Network Management	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	IP --- Solaris IP --- CISCO
Data Mining	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	Oracle ---- Oracle
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	Custom --- Lockheed

Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Local Area Network (LAN)	Fast Ethernet --- CISCO
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	Router --- CISCO Catalyst --- CISCO
Network Management	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	Solaris --- SUN
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	Custom --- Lockheed
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	PVCS --- Serena (Merant)
Software Development	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	Custom --- Lockheed Doors --- Telelogic

Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?   No

   a. If "yes," please describe.

6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system?   No

   a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)?

      1. If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services).

Exhibit 300: Part III: For "Operation and Maintenance" investments ONLY (Steady State)

III.A. Risk Management

Part III should be completed only for investments which will be in "Operation and Maintenance" (Steady State) in FY 2008, i.e., selected the "Operation and Maintenance" choice in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial

concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

Answer the following questions to describe how you are managing investment risks.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?	Yes
a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?	10/18/2004
b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?	No
c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:	
2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?	
a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?	
b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?	

III.B. Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Was operational analysis conducted?	Yes
a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed.	7/31/2006
b. If "yes," what were the results?	
Redacted	
c. If "no," please explain why it was not conducted and if there are any plans to conduct operational analysis in the future:	

Complete the following table to compare actual cost performance against the planned cost performance baseline. Milestones reported may include specific individual scheduled preventative and predictable corrective maintenance activities, or may be the total of planned annual operation and maintenance efforts:	
a. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information (Government Only/Contractor Only/Both)?	Redacted

2. Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table	

Comparison of Plan vs. Actual Performance Table   Redacted